

# QUASIMULTIPLIERS OF OPERATOR SPACES

MASAYOSHI KANEDA AND VERN I. PAULSEN

**ABSTRACT.** We use the injective envelope to study quasimultipliers of operator spaces. We prove that all representable operator algebra products that an operator space can be endowed with are induced by quasimultipliers. We obtain generalizations of the Banach-Stone theorem.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

We begin with some general algebraic comments, inspired by [10], that make clear the role that quasimultipliers can play. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be an algebra and let  $X \subseteq \mathcal{A}$  be a subspace. We shall call an element  $z \in \mathcal{A}$  a *quasimultiplier of  $X$  (relative to  $\mathcal{A}$ )* provided that  $XzX \subseteq X$ , i.e.,  $x_1zx_2 \in X$  for every  $x_1, x_2 \in X$ . Clearly, the set of quasimultipliers of  $X$  is a linear subspace of  $\mathcal{A}$ . Moreover, each quasimultiplier  $z$  induces a bilinear map  $m_z : X \times X \rightarrow X$  defined by  $m_z(x_1, x_2) := x_1zx_2$ . The associativity of the product on  $\mathcal{A}$ , implies that each  $m_z$  is an associative bilinear map and hence can be regarded as a product on  $X$ . This product gives  $X$  the structure of an algebra, which we denote by  $(X, m_z)$ . There are two homomorphisms,  $\pi_l$  and  $\pi_r$  from this algebra into  $\mathcal{A}$ , defined by  $\pi_l(x) := xz$  and  $\pi_r(x) := zx$ .

The range of  $\pi_l$  is contained in the subalgebra of *left multipliers of  $X$  (relative to  $\mathcal{A}$ )*, while the range of  $\pi_r$  is contained in the subalgebra of *right multipliers of  $X$  (relative to  $\mathcal{A}$ )*. Recall that an element  $a \in \mathcal{A}$  is called a *left (respectively, right) multiplier of  $X$*  provided that  $aX \subseteq X$  (respectively,  $Xa \subseteq X$ ). Finally, note that since the quasimultipliers are a linear subspace of  $\mathcal{A}$ , the set of “products” on  $X$  that one obtains in this manner is a linear subspace of the vector space of bilinear maps from  $X \times X$  into  $X$ .

In general, linear (or, even convex) combinations of associative bilinear maps need not be associative. For an example of this phenomena, consider  $X = \mathbb{C}^2$  and the associative bilinear maps,  $m_1((a, b), (c, d)) := (ac, bd)$  and  $m_2((a, b), (c, d)) := (ac, bc)$ . Their convex combination,  $m := (m_1 + m_2)/2$ , is not associative.

One shortcoming of the above representation of quasimultipliers is that it is *extrinsic*. The quasimultipliers that one obtains and their induced bilinear maps, could easily depend on the algebra  $\mathcal{A}$  and on the particular

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 46L05; Secondary 46A22, 46H25, 46M10, 47A20.

*Key words and phrases*. injective, multipliers, operator space, Banach-Stone.

Research supported in part by a grant from the National Science Foundation.

embedding of  $X$  into  $\mathcal{A}$  and not on *intrinsic* properties of  $X$ . Thus, the totality of bilinear maps that one could obtain in this manner would be a union of linear spaces, taken over all embeddings of  $X$  into an algebra, which would no longer need to be a linear space.

In this paper, we develop a theory of quasimultipliers of operator spaces and then use the injective envelope to give an intrinsic characterization of quasimultipliers and of their associated bilinear maps. Among the results that we obtain are that an operator space endowed with a completely contractive product can be represented completely isometrically as an algebra of operators on some Hilbert space if and only if the product is a bilinear map that belongs to this space of “bilinear quasimultipliers”. As a corollary, we find that the set of “representable” completely contractive products is a convex set. In fact, it is affinely isomorphic with the unit ball of the space of quasimultipliers.

We then turn our attention to generalizations of the Banach-Stone theorem. Our basic result is that a linear complete isometry between any two operator algebras induces a quasimultiplier and that by using the quasimultiplier, one recovers earlier generalizations of the Banach-Stone theorem.

## 2. QUASIMULTIPLIERS

In this section we introduce various spaces of quasimultipliers of an operator space and develop some of their key properties. Let  $X$  be an operator space,  $\mathcal{H}$  be a Hilbert space,  $B(\mathcal{H})$  denote the algebra of bounded, linear operators on  $\mathcal{H}$ , and let  $\phi : X \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  be a complete isometry. We set

$$QM_\phi(X) := \{z \in B(\mathcal{H}) : \phi(X)z\phi(X) \subseteq \phi(X)\},$$

and we call  $QM_\phi(X)$  the space of *quasimultipliers of  $X$  relative to  $\phi$* . Note that  $QM_\phi(X)$  is a norm closed subspace of  $B(\mathcal{H})$ .

Each  $z \in QM_\phi(X)$  induces a bilinear map,  $m_z : X \times X \rightarrow X$  defined by  $m_z(x_1, x_2) := \phi^{-1}(\phi(x_1)z\phi(x_2))$ . The bilinear map  $m_z$  is completely bounded in the sense of Christensen-Sinclair, that is, its linear extension is completely bounded as a map from  $X \otimes_h X$  to  $X$  with  $\|m_z\|_{cb} \leq \|z\|$ . We say that  $m_z$  is the *bilinear map induced by  $z$* .

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $QMB(X)$  denote the set of bilinear maps from  $X \times X$  to  $X$ , that are of the form  $m_z$  for some quasimultiplier  $z$  and some completely isometric map  $\phi$  from  $X$  into the bounded linear operators on some Hilbert space. For  $m \in QMB(X)$  we set  $\|m\|_{qm} := \inf\{\|z\| : m = m_z\}$ , where the infimum is taken over all possible completely isometric maps  $\phi$  and  $z$  as above.

Note that by the above remarks, every  $m \in QMB(X)$  is completely bounded as a bilinear map and  $\|m\|_{cb} \leq \|m\|_{qm}$ . We shall show in Example 2.11 that this inequality can be sharp. For a fixed map  $\phi$ , the set of bilinear maps,  $\{m_z : z \in QM_\phi(X)\}$  is a linear subspace of the set  $QMB(X)$ . However, since  $QMB(X)$  is the union of these subspaces, it is not clear that

it is a vector subspace of the vector space of bilinear maps from  $X \times X$  to  $X$ . We shall prove that it is a vector space later.

The above definitions are extrinsic, in the sense that they could depend on the particular embedding. We now seek intrinsic characterizations of these maps by using the injective envelope as in [12] and [7] (see also [18]).

We begin by recalling a construction used in [7], but we prefer the notation from [18].

Recall that if  $X \subseteq B(\mathcal{K}, \mathcal{H})$  is a (concrete) operator space, then we may form the (concrete) operator system, in  $B(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{K})$ ,

$$\mathcal{S}_X := \left\{ \left( \frac{\lambda I_{\mathcal{H}}}{y^*} \middle| \frac{x}{\mu I_{\mathcal{K}}} \right) : \lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{C}, x, y \in X \right\}.$$

Given a complete isometry  $\varphi: X \rightarrow B(\mathcal{K}_1, \mathcal{H}_1)$ , the operator system

$$\mathcal{S}_{\varphi(X)} := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \lambda I_{\mathcal{H}_1} & \varphi(x) \\ \varphi(y)^* & \mu I_{\mathcal{K}_1} \end{pmatrix} : \lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{C}, x, y \in X \right\}$$

is completely order isomorphic to  $\mathcal{S}_X$  via the map,  $\Phi: \mathcal{S}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{\varphi(X)}$  defined by

$$\Phi \left( \begin{pmatrix} \lambda I_{\mathcal{H}} & x \\ y^* & \mu I_{\mathcal{K}} \end{pmatrix} \right) := \begin{pmatrix} \lambda I_{\mathcal{H}_1} & \varphi(x) \\ \varphi(y)^* & \mu I_{\mathcal{K}_1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus, the operator system  $\mathcal{S}_X$  only depends on the operator space structure of  $X$  and not on any particular representation of  $X$ .

Since  $\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C} \cong \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} \lambda I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & \mu I_{\mathcal{K}} \end{pmatrix} : \lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{C} \right\}$  is a  $C^*$ -subalgebra of  $\mathcal{S}_X$ ,  $\mathbb{C} \oplus \mathbb{C}$  will still be a  $C^*$ -subalgebra of the  $C^*$ -algebra,  $I(\mathcal{S}_X)$  with  $\begin{pmatrix} I_{\mathcal{H}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I_{\mathcal{K}} \end{pmatrix}$  corresponding to orthogonal projections  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ , respectively, in the  $C^*$ -algebra  $I(\mathcal{S}_X)$ . We have that  $e_1 + e_2$  is equal to the identity and  $e_1 \cdot e_2 = 0$ .

A few words on such a situation are in order. Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be any unital  $C^*$ -algebra with orthogonal projections  $e_1$  and  $e_2$  satisfying  $e_1 + e_2 = 1$ ,  $e_1 \cdot e_2 = 0$  and let  $\pi: \mathcal{A} \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  be a one-to-one unital  $*$ -homomorphism. Setting  $\mathcal{H}_1 = \pi(e_1)\mathcal{H}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}_2 = \pi(e_2)\mathcal{H}$  we have that  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_2$  and relative to this decomposition every  $T \in B(\mathcal{H})$  has the form  $T = (T_{ij})$  where  $T_{ij} \in B(\mathcal{H}_j, \mathcal{H}_i)$ . In particular, identifying  $\mathcal{A}$  with  $\pi(\mathcal{A})$  we have that

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{pmatrix} : a_{ij} \in \mathcal{A}_{ij} \right\}$$

where  $\mathcal{A}_{ij} = e_i \mathcal{A} e_j$ , with  $\mathcal{A}_{ii} \subseteq B(\mathcal{H}_i)$  unital  $C^*$ -subalgebras and  $\mathcal{A}_{21} = \mathcal{A}_{12}^*$ . The operator space  $\mathcal{A}_{12} \subseteq B(\mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_1)$  will be referred to as a *corner of  $\mathcal{A}$* . Note that  $\mathcal{A}_{11} \cdot \mathcal{A}_{12} \cdot \mathcal{A}_{22} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{12}$  so that  $\mathcal{A}_{12}$  is an  $\mathcal{A}_{11} - \mathcal{A}_{22}$ -bimodule.

Returning to  $I(\mathcal{S}_X)$ , relative to  $e_1$  and  $e_2$ , we wish to identify each of these 4 subspaces. Note that  $X \subseteq e_1 I(\mathcal{S}_X) e_2 = I(\mathcal{S}_X)_{12}$ . As shown in Chapter 16 of [18], we may identify  $I(\mathcal{S}_X)_{12} = I(X)$ .

We define,  $I_{11}(X) := I(\mathcal{S}_X)_{11}$  and  $I_{22}(X) := I(\mathcal{S}_X)_{22}$ . Thus we have the following picture of the  $C^*$ -algebra  $I(\mathcal{S}_X)$ , namely,

$$I(\mathcal{S}_X) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & z \\ w^* & b \end{pmatrix} : a \in I_{11}(X), b \in I_{22}(X), z, w \in I(X) \right\}$$

where  $I_{11}(X)$  and  $I_{22}(X)$  are injective  $C^*$ -algebras and  $I(X)$  is an operator  $I_{11}(X) - I_{22}(X)$ -bimodule. Moreover, the fact that  $I(\mathcal{S}_X)$  is a  $C^*$ -algebra means that for  $z, w \in I(X)$ ,

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & z \\ w^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & z \\ w^* & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} zw^* & 0 \\ 0 & w^*z \end{pmatrix}$$

and consequently there are natural products,  $z \cdot w^* \in I_{11}(X)$ ,  $w^* \cdot z \in I_{22}(X)$ .

It is interesting to note that setting  $\langle z, w \rangle = zw^*$  defines an  $I_{11}(X)$ -valued inner product that makes  $I(X)$  a Hilbert  $C^*$ -module over  $I_{11}(X)$ , but we shall not use this additional structure.

**Definition 2.2.** We set  $QM(X) := \{z \in I(X)^* : XzX \subseteq X\}$ , where the products are all taken in the  $C^*$ -algebra  $I(\mathcal{S}_X)$ .

In [10] a theory was developed of quasimultipliers of Hilbert  $C^*$ -bimodules. If  $X$  is a Hilbert  $C^*$ -bimodule, then they also use the notation,  $QM(X)$ , for their quasimultipliers. We warn the reader, and apologize, that although we are using the same notation, our quasimultipliers and theirs are not the same objects. In the first place their quasimultipliers are defined using the second dual of the linking algebra and their quasimultipliers are a subset of the second dual of  $X$ .

Briefly, if  $X$  is a Hilbert  $A - B$ -bimodule, then an element  $t$  in the second dual of  $X$  is a quasimultiplier in the sense of [10] provided that  $AtB \subseteq X$  where the products are defined in the second dual of the linking algebra. Note that if  $A$  and  $B$  are both unital  $C^*$ -algebras, then this forces  $t \in X$ .

To make our quasimultiplier theory fit with theirs a bit better, we should have perhaps taken adjoints of elements so that our  $QM(X)$  is a subset of  $I(X)$ . However, this alternate definition would have made several natural maps, that we define later, conjugate linear and we believe that it would have led to the “opposite”, i.e., transposed operator space structure.

**Theorem 2.3.** Let  $X$  be an operator space,  $\mathcal{H}$  be a Hilbert space and let  $\phi : X \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$ , be a complete isometry. Then there exists a unique, completely contractive map  $\gamma : QM_\phi(X) \rightarrow QM(X)$  such that  $\phi(x_1)z\phi(x_2) = \phi(x_1\gamma(z)x_2)$  for all  $x_1, x_2 \in X$  and every  $z \in QM_\phi(X)$ .

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Theorem 1.7 in [7]. Let  $\mathcal{S}_{\phi(X)} \subseteq B(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H})$  be the concrete operator system defined above and let  $C^*(\mathcal{S}_{\phi(X)})$  be the  $C^*$ -subalgebra of  $B(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H})$  that it generates. The  $C^*$ -subalgebra of  $I(\mathcal{S}_X)$  generated by  $S_X$  is known to be the  $C^*$ -envelope of  $S_X$ ,  $C_e^*(S_X)$ . Consequently, by [15] Corollary 4.2 the identity map on  $S_X$  extends to be a surjective  $*$ -homomorphism  $\pi : C^*(\mathcal{S}_{\phi(X)}) \rightarrow C_e^*(S_X)$ .

Let  $\Gamma : B(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}) \rightarrow I(S_X)$  be a completely positive map that extends this  $*$ -homomorphism. Since  $\Gamma$  extends  $\pi$ , it will be a  $\pi$ -bimodule map, that is, for  $A, B \in C^*(S_{\phi(X)})$  we will have that  $\Gamma(ATB) = \pi(A)\Gamma(T)\pi(B)$ . This forces  $\Gamma$  to be a matrix of maps, that is, for  $T = \begin{pmatrix} T_{11} & T_{12} \\ T_{21} & T_{22} \end{pmatrix} \in B(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H})$  we will have that  $\Gamma(T) = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{11}(T_{11}) & \gamma_{12}(T_{12}) \\ \gamma_{21}(T_{21}) & \gamma_{22}(T_{22}) \end{pmatrix}$ .

In particular, for  $x \in X$  and  $z \in QM_\phi(X)$  we will have that  $\Gamma\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \phi(x) \\ z & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x \\ \gamma_{21}(z) & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ .

Hence by the  $\pi$ -bimodule property, for  $x_1, x_2 \in X$  and  $z \in QM_\phi(X)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \phi(x_1)z\phi(x_2) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) &= \Gamma\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \phi(x_1) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ z & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \phi(x_2) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \gamma_{21}(z) & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1\gamma_{21}(z)x_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it follows that  $\gamma_{21}(z) \in QM(X)$  and  $\phi(x_1\gamma_{21}(z)x_2) = \phi(x_1)z\phi(x_2)$ . Because  $\Gamma$  is a unital, completely positive map,  $\gamma_{21}$  is completely contractive.

Finally, the uniqueness of the map comes from the following observation. Suppose  $q_1, q_2 \in QM(X)$  have the property that  $x_1q_1x_2 = x_1q_2x_2$  for every  $x_1, x_2 \in X$ . This implies that  $(x_1q_1 - x_1q_2)X = 0$  and so by Corollary 1.3 of [7], we have that  $x_1(q_1 - q_2) = 0$  for every  $x_1 \in X$ . Applying the corollary again, we see that  $X(q_1 - q_2)(q_1 - q_2)^* = 0$  and so  $q_1 = q_2$ .  $\square$

**Remark 2.4.** Let  $A$  be a  $C^*$ -algebra and let  $\pi_u : A \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H}_u)$  be its universal representation. The classical definition of the quasimultiplier space of  $A$  as given in [19] is the set  $QM_{\pi_u}(A)$ . In [17], the first author proves that the map  $\gamma : QM_{\pi_u}(A) \rightarrow QM(A)$  is an onto complete isometry, and preserve quasimultiplication. Thus, at least in the case of a  $C^*$ -algebra our definition and the classical definition agree.

**Corollary 2.5.** Let  $X$  be an operator space. The map  $z \mapsto m_z$  from  $QM(X)$  to  $QMB(X)$  equipped with  $\|\cdot\|_{qm}$  is an onto isometry, where  $m_z : X \times X \rightarrow X$  is defined by  $m_z(x_1, x_2) := x_1zx_2$ . Consequently,  $QMB(X)$  is a linear subspace of the vector space of bilinear maps from  $X \times X$  to  $X$ .

Let  $X$  be an operator space. Given an associative, bilinear map  $m : X \times X \rightarrow X$ , we let  $(X, m)$  denote the resulting algebra. We let  $CCP(X)$  denote the set of associative bilinear maps on  $X$  that are completely contractive in the sense of Christensen-Sinclair, that is,  $CCP(X)$  denotes the set of *completely contractive products on  $X$* . We let  $OAP(X) \subseteq CCP(X)$  denote those maps such that the algebra  $(X, m)$  has a completely isometric homomorphism into  $B(\mathcal{H})$  for some Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . That is,  $OAP(X)$  denotes the set of *operator algebra products on  $X$* .

We let  $CBP(X)$  denote those associative, bilinear maps from  $X \times X$  to  $X$  (i.e., products on  $X$ ), that are completely bounded in the sense of Christensen-Sinclair, that is the set of *completely bounded algebra products*. By a result of [1],  $m \in CBP(X)$  if and only if there exists a Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and a completely bounded homomorphism,  $\pi : (X, m) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  with completely bounded inverse,  $\pi^{-1} : \pi(X) \rightarrow (X, m)$ . In fact, by [1] one may choose  $\pi$  such that  $\|\pi\|_{cb}\|\pi^{-1}\|_{cb} \leq 1 + \epsilon$  for any  $\epsilon \geq 0$ . Finally, we let  $SOAP(X) \subseteq CBP(X)$  denote those associative, bilinear maps for which one can choose,  $\pi$  satisfying,  $\|\pi\|_{cb}\|\pi^{-1}\|_{cb} = 1$ , i.e., such that  $\pi$  is a scalar multiple of a complete isometry. These are the *scaled operator algebra products*.

The following theorem illustrates the importance of quasimultipliers.

**Theorem 2.6.** *Let  $X$  be an operator space. Then  $QMB(X) = SOAP(X)$  and  $OAP(X) = \{m \in QMB(X) : \|m\|_{qm} \leq 1\}$ .*

*Proof.* We prove the second equality first. Let  $m \in OAP(X)$  and let  $\pi : (X, m) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  be a completely isometric homomorphism. Then  $I_{\mathcal{H}}$  is a quasimultiplier of  $\pi(X)$  that induces the bilinear map  $m$ . Thus,  $m \in QMB(X)$  and  $\|m\|_{qm} \leq 1$ . Conversely, let  $m \in QMB(X)$  with  $\|m\|_{qm} \leq 1$ . Then there exists  $z \in QM(X)$  with  $\|z\| \leq 1$  such that  $m = m_z$ .

As [8] Remark 2, define  $\pi : (X, m) \rightarrow I(S_X)$  by

$$\pi(x) := \begin{pmatrix} xz & x\sqrt{1-zz^*} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is easily seen that,  $\pi(x_1)\pi(x_2) = \pi(x_1zx_2) = \pi(m(x_1, x_2))$  and that  $\|\pi(x)\|^2 = \|\pi(x)\pi(x)^*\| = \|xx^*\| = \|x\|^2$ , where all products take place in  $I(S_X)$ . Thus,  $\pi$  is an isometric homomorphism. The proof that  $\pi$  is completely isometric is similar and thus  $m \in OAP(X)$ .

If  $m \in SOAP(X)$  and  $\pi : (X, m) \rightarrow B(\mathcal{H})$  is a completely bounded homomorphism such that  $\phi = \pi/\|\pi\|_{cb}$ , is a complete isometry, then  $I_{\mathcal{H}}$  is a quasimultiplier of  $\phi(X)$ . We have that

$$\phi(x_1)I_{\mathcal{H}}\phi(x_2) = \|\pi\|_{cb}^{-2}\pi(x_1)\pi(x_2) = \|\pi\|_{cb}^{-2}\pi(m(x_1, x_2)) = \|\pi\|_{cb}^{-1}\phi(m(x_1, x_2)).$$

Hence,  $m \in QMB(X)$  and  $\|m\|_{qm} \leq \|\pi\|_{cb}$ .

Conversely, if  $m(x_1, x_2) = x_1zx_2$  for  $z \in QM(X)$  with  $\|z\| = r$ , then consider

$$\pi(x) = \begin{pmatrix} xz & x\sqrt{r^2-zz^*} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and argue as above to prove that  $\pi$  is a homomorphism and is  $r$  times a complete isometry.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.7.** *Let  $X$  be an operator space, then  $OAP(X)$  is a convex set, and  $SOAP(X)$  is a vector space.*

The following example shows that, in general,  $CCP(X)$  and  $CBP(X)$  are not convex sets.

**Example 2.8.** *The following example shows that, in general,  $OAP(X) \neq CCP(X)$ ,  $SOAP(X) \neq CBP(X)$ , and that the sets  $CCP(X)$  and  $CBP(X)$  need not be convex.*

*Let  $X = C_2$ , that is, the subspace of the two by two matrices,  $M_2$  consisting of those matrices that are 0 in the second column and whose first column is arbitrary. Let  $m_1\left(\begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} c \\ d \end{pmatrix}\right) := \begin{pmatrix} ac \\ bd \end{pmatrix}$  and  $m_2\left(\begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} c \\ d \end{pmatrix}\right) := \begin{pmatrix} ac \\ bc \end{pmatrix}$  be as in the introduction.*

*Since  $m_2$  is the product on  $C_2$  induced by the inclusion of  $C_2$  into  $M_2$ , we have that  $m_2 \in OAP(C_2) \subseteq CCP(C_2)$ .*

*We claim that  $m_1 \in CCP(C_2)$ . To see this claim, note that if we identify  $M_n(C_2) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix} : A, B \in M_n \right\}$ , then  $m_1^{(n)}\left(\begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} C \\ D \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} AC \\ BD \end{pmatrix}$ . If  $\left\| \begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq 1$  and  $\left\| \begin{pmatrix} C \\ D \end{pmatrix} \right\| \leq 1$ , then  $\left\| \begin{pmatrix} AC \\ BD \end{pmatrix} \right\|^2 = \|C^*A^*AC + D^*B^*BD\|$ . However,  $0 \leq C^*A^*AC + D^*B^*BD \leq C^*C + D^*D \leq I$  and so  $\|m_1\|_{cb} \leq 1$ . Thus,  $m_1 \in CCP(X)$  as claimed.*

*Since  $(m_1 + m_2)/2$  is not even associative, we see that  $CCP(C_2)$  is not convex and hence cannot be equal to  $OAP(C_2)$ . Since  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are both also in  $CBP(C_2)$ , we have that this set is also not convex and hence it is not equal to  $SOAP(C_2)$ . Also, since  $SOAP(C_2)$  is convex and  $m_2 \in SOAP(C_2)$ , it must be the case that  $m_1$  is not in  $SOAP(C_2)$ .*

*This last fact can also be seen by using the injective envelope and Theorem 2.6. Since  $C_2$  is already an injective operator space, we have that  $I(C_2)^* = C_2^* = R_2$ , where  $R_2$  denotes the corresponding row space. Since  $C_2 R_2 C_2 \subseteq C_2$ , we have that  $QM(C_2) = R_2$ . Now it is easily checked that there is no  $z = (e, f) \in R_2$  such that  $m_1(x_1, x_2) = x_1 z x_2$  and so  $m_1$  is not in  $QMB(C_2) = SOAP(C_2)$ .*

*Finally, note that  $\pi : (C_2, m_1) \rightarrow M_2$  defined by  $\pi\left(\begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}\right) := \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{pmatrix}$  is a completely contractive homomorphism with completely bounded inverse. Which gives a direct way, independent of Blecher's theorem [1], to see that  $(C_2, m_1)$  is completely boundedly representable.*

*It is also interesting to note that for the natural inclusion  $\phi : C_2 \rightarrow M_2$ , we have that  $QM_\phi(C_2)$  is all of  $M_2$ , while  $QM(C_2) = R_2$  is 2-dimensional. Thus, we see that the map  $\gamma$  of Theorem 2.3 need not be one-to-one.*

**Remark 2.9.** *Although,  $OAP(X)$  is a convex set and  $CCP(X)$  is not in general, we know little else about the structure of  $CCP(X)$  or about the subset of  $CCP(X)$  consisting of those products that can be induced by a completely contractive, but not completely isometric representation. The product  $m_1$  from Example 2.8 is one such product.*

*For a finite dimensional vector space the set of associative bilinear maps is an algebraic set. Thus, when  $X$  is a finite-dimensional operator space,  $CCP(X)$  is the intersection of this algebraic set with the set of completely*

*contractive bilinear maps. Generally, the set of completely contractive bilinear maps need not even be a semialgebraic set. But it is still possible that the intersection,  $CCP(X)$ , is a semialgebraic set.*

The following result illustrates how some of the results of [5] on operator algebras with one-sided identities can be deduced from the theory of quasimultipliers.

**Proposition 2.10.** *Let  $X$  be an operator space and let  $m \in OAP(X)$ . Then  $(X, m)$  has a right contractive identity  $e$  if and only if  $m = m_z$  where  $z \in QM(X)$  satisfies  $z^* = e$ , and  $zz^*$  is the identity of  $I_{22}(X)$ . In this case the map  $x \rightarrow xz$  defines a completely isometric homomorphism of  $(X, m)$  into  $M_l(X)$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $m \in OAP(X)$  we have that  $m = m_z$  for some  $z \in QM(X)$  with  $\|z\| \leq 1$ .

Assume that  $(X, m)$  has a contractive right identity  $e$ . Then we have that for every  $x \in X$ ,  $x = m(x, e) = xze$ . Hence,  $x(1_{22} - ze) = 0$  for every  $x \in X$ . By [7] Corollary 1.3, this implies that  $1_{22} - ze = 0$ . But since both  $z$  and  $e$  are contractions,  $e = z^*$  must hold.

Conversely, if  $z^* = e$  and  $zz^* = 1_{22}$ , then clearly,  $m(x, e) = xze = x$  and so  $e$  is a contractive, right identity.

Finally, since  $\|x\| = \|xzz^*\| \leq \|xz\|$ , we see that the completely contractive homomorphism of  $(X, m)$  into  $M_l(X)$  given by  $x \rightarrow xz$  is a complete isometry.  $\square$

Note that by the above result, the relationship between the product  $m$  and the product in  $I(S_X)$  is that  $m(x_1, x_2) = x_1 e^* x_2$ .

There is an analogous result for left identities.

It is possible for a concrete algebra of operators to have a two-sided identity  $e$  of norm greater than one. For an example see [18], page 279. In this case the multiplication will still be given by a contractive quasimultiplier  $z$  and one has  $ze = 1_{22}$ ,  $ez = 1_{11}$  but one no longer has that  $e = z^*$ .

We close this section with a number of examples of spaces of quasimultipliers that illustrate the limits of some of the above results.

**Example 2.11.** *This example shows that it is possible to have  $\|z\| > \|m_z\|_{cb}$  for a quasimultiplier. It is based on Example 4.4 of [2].*

Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq M_3$  denote the subalgebra that is the span of  $\{E_{12}, E_{13}, I_3\}$ , where  $I_3$  denotes the identity matrix. Let  $Q := I_3 + J$  where  $J$  is the matrix whose entries are all 1's, and set  $P := Q^{1/2}$ . A little calculation shows that  $P = I_3 + \frac{1}{3}J$  and that  $P^{-1} = I_3 - \frac{1}{6}J$ .

We let  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{A}P$ . Since the  $C^*$ -subalgebra of  $M_3$  generated by  $\mathcal{X}$  is all of  $M_3$ , which is irreducible, one finds that  $I_{11}(\mathcal{X}) = I(\mathcal{X}) = M_3$ , with the usual product. From this we see quite easily that  $M_l(\mathcal{X}) = \mathcal{A}$  and  $QM(\mathcal{X}) = P^{-1}\mathcal{A}$ .

Let  $Z := P^{-1}(E_{12} - E_{13})$ , so that  $\|Z\| = \sqrt{3/2}$ . Writing  $X_i, Y_i \in \mathcal{X}$  as  $X_i = (a_i I_3 + N_i)P, Y_i = (b_i I_3 + M_i)P$  where  $N_i$  and  $M_i$  are in the span of  $E_{12}$  and  $E_{13}$ , we have that,  $m_Z(X_i, Y_i) := X_i Z Y_i = a_i b_i (E_{12} - E_{13})P$ .

Since  $\|(E_{12} - E_{13})P\| = \sqrt{2}$ , we have that  $\|m_Z\| = \kappa\sqrt{2}$ , where  $\kappa = \sup\{|\sum a_i b_i| : \|(X_1, \dots, X_n)\| \leq 1, \|(Y_1^*, \dots, Y_n^*)\| \leq 1\}$  and  $m_Z$  is the linear map  $m_Z : \mathcal{A} \otimes_h \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ . The first inequality implies that  $I_3 \geq \sum X_i X_i^*$ . Examining the  $(3,3)$ -entry of these matrices leads to the conclusion that  $2 \sum |a_i|^2 \leq 1$ . The second inequality implies that  $\sum (b_i I_3 + M_i)^* (b_i I_3 + M_i) \leq P^{-2}$ . Examining the  $(1,1)$ -entry of these matrices leads to the conclusion that  $\sum |b_i|^2 \leq 3/4$  and hence,  $\kappa \leq \sqrt{3/8}$ .

Thus, we are led to conclude that  $\|m_Z\| \leq \sqrt{3/4} < \sqrt{3/2}$ .

The same calculation, using matrix coefficients for the entries of  $X_i$  and  $Y_i$  shows that  $\|m_Z\|_{cb} \leq \sqrt{3/4}$  too, and so the result follows. Indeed, if we write  $X, Y \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$  as  $X = A \otimes E_{11} + C \otimes E_{12} + D \otimes E_{13} + A \otimes E_{22} + A \otimes E_{33}$  and  $Y = B \otimes E_{11} + G \otimes E_{12} + H \otimes E_{13} + B \otimes E_{22} + B \otimes E_{33}$  where  $A, B, C, D, G, H$  are in  $M_n$ , then it is easily seen that  $m_Z^{(n)}(X, Y) = AB \otimes (E_{12} - E_{13})P$ . Now taking  $X_i \in M_n(\mathcal{A})$  with  $\|(X_1, \dots, X_m)\| \leq 1$  implies that  $\sum X_i X_i^* \leq I_3 \otimes I_n$  and examining in the  $(1,1)$ -block of this matrix inequality yields,  $\sum A_i A_i^* \leq I_n$ . Similarly one gets that  $\sum B_i^* B_i \leq 3/4 I_n$ . Hence,  $\sum A_i B_i = (A_1, \dots, A_m) \cdot (B_1, \dots, B_m)^t$  and these estimates yield that the norm of the row of  $A$ 's is less than one and norm of the column of  $B$ 's is less than  $\sqrt{3/4}$ .

In fact, it is not too hard to show that  $\|m_Z\| = \|m_Z\|_{cb} = \sqrt{3/4}$ .

**Example 2.12.** Let  $\{E_{ij}\}$  denote the canonical matrix units and let  $X = \text{span}\{E_{11}, E_{12}, E_{21}, E_{32}\} \subseteq M_{3,2}$ . We compute  $QM(X)$  for this space and illustrate some of its properties.

It is not difficult to show that  $I(S_X) = \begin{pmatrix} M_3 & M_{3,2} \\ M_{2,3} & M_2 \end{pmatrix} = M_5$ , with the obvious identifications. To see this one first shows that since  $X$  is a  $\mathcal{D}_3 - \mathcal{D}_2$ -bimodule, where  $\mathcal{D}_n$  denotes the  $n \times n$  diagonal matrices, then any completely contractive map  $\Phi$  from  $M_{3,2}$  into itself that fixes  $X$  must be a bimodule map. From this it follows that  $\Phi$  must be given as a Shur product map, but then the fact that  $\Phi$  is completely contractive forces  $\Phi$  to be the identity map.

Now a direct calculation shows that  $QM(X) = \text{span}\{E_{12}, E_{23}\} \subseteq M_{2,3}$ , that  $M_l(X) = \text{span}\{E_{11}, E_{12}, E_{13}, E_{22}, E_{33}\} \subseteq M_3$  and that  $M_r(X) = \text{span}\{E_{11}, E_{22}\} \subseteq M_2$ .

Note that the span of the products  $X \cdot QM(X)$  is not dense in  $M_l(X)$  but that the span of the products  $QM(X) \cdot X$  is all of  $M_r(X)$ .

For the contractive quasimultiplier  $z = E_{12} + E_{23}$ , we see that the induced homomorphism  $\pi_l(x) = xz$  into  $M_l(X)$  is a complete isometry, but that  $\pi_r(x) = zx$  is not even one-to-one. For the quasimultipliers  $E_{12}$  and  $E_{23}$  neither  $\pi_l$  nor  $\pi_r$  is one-to-one.

**Example 2.13.** Let  $X = \text{span}\{E_{11} + E_{32}, E_{21} + E_{33}\} \subseteq M_3$ . This space can be identified as a concrete representation of the maximum of  $C_2$  and  $R_2$ , that

is, as the least operator space structure on  $\mathbb{C}^2$  that is greater than both  $C_2$  and  $R_2$ . We will show that  $QM(X) = (0)$  and consequently, there are no non-trivial operator algebra products on this operator space, i.e.,  $OAP(X) = (0)$ . However, since the natural maps from  $X$  to the concrete operator algebras  $C_2 \subseteq M_2$  and  $R_2 \subseteq M_2$  are both complete contractions, we see that there are at least 4 different products (up to scaling) in  $CCP(X)$  that have completely contractive representations whose inverses are completely bounded.

To see these claims, one first shows that if one regards  $S_X \subseteq M_6$ , then  $C^*(S_X) = I(S_X)$ . From this it follows that  $I_{11}(X) = M_2 \oplus \mathbb{C}$ ,  $I_{22}(X) = \mathbb{C} \oplus M_2$ ,  $I(X) = \text{span}\{E_{11}, E_{32}, E_{21}, E_{33}\}$  and that  $M_l(X)$  and  $M_r(X)$  are both just the scalar multiples of the identity. Once these things are seen, it is straightforward to check that  $QM(X) = (0)$ .

To prove that  $C^*(S_X) = I(S_X)$ , first note that there is a  $*$ -homomorphism of  $C^*(S_X)$  onto the  $C^*$ -subalgebra of  $I(S_X)$  generated by the copy of  $S_X$ , i.e., onto the boundary  $C^*$ -algebra. But the original  $C^*$ -algebra has only 2 ideals that could be the kernel of this map. Now argue that if you mod out by either ideal then you will not have a 2-isometry on  $S_X$ . Hence this homomorphism must be 1-1. But  $C^*(S_X)$  is injective so we are done.

### 3. A NON-COMMUTATIVE BANACH-STONE THEOREM

In this section we use quasimultipliers to obtain a characterization of linear complete isometries from one operator algebra onto another. Our theorem needs no assumptions concerning the existence of units or approximate units.

To understand the statement of the theorem, it is perhaps instructive to keep the following example in mind. Let  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq B(\mathcal{H})$  be a unital  $C^*$ -subalgebra and let  $\mathcal{B} := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} : a \in \mathcal{A} \right\} \subseteq B(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H})$ . These are both algebras of operators, although the product of any two elements of  $\mathcal{B}$  is 0. The identification of  $\mathcal{A}$  with  $\mathcal{B}$  is a complete isometry, onto, but clearly the only possible homomorphism between these two algebras is the 0 map. However, in this example one sees that the left multipliers of  $\mathcal{B}$  can be identified with the  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{A}$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  be algebras of operators and let  $\psi : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be a linear complete isometry that is onto. Then we have the following:*

- (1) *there exists a unique  $z \in QM(\mathcal{A})$ , with  $\|z\| \leq 1$  such that  $\psi(a_1)\psi(a_2) = \psi(a_1za_2)$  for every  $a_1, a_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ ;*
- (2) *there exists a unique  $w \in QM(\mathcal{B})$ , with  $\|w\| \leq 1$  such that  $\psi(a_1a_2) = \psi(a_1)w\psi(a_2)$  for every  $a_1, a_2 \in \mathcal{A}$ ;*
- (3) *setting  $\pi_l(a) = \psi(a)w$  and  $\pi_r(a) = w\psi(a)$  defines completely contractive homomorphisms of  $\mathcal{A}$  into  $M_l(\mathcal{B})$  and  $M_r(\mathcal{B})$ , respectively;*
- (4) *if  $\mathcal{A}$  has a contractive right (respectively, left) approximate identity, then  $\pi_l$  (respectively,  $\pi_r$ ) is a completely isometric homomorphism;*

- (5) if  $\mathcal{A}$  has a contractive right (respectively, left) identity,  $e$ , then  $w = \psi(e)^*$  and  $ww^*$  is the identity of  $I_{22}(\mathcal{B})$  (respectively,  $w^*w$  is the identity of  $I_{11}(\mathcal{B})$ ).

*Proof.* Set  $\gamma := \psi^{-1}$  and define  $m : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$  by  $m(a_1, a_2) := \gamma(\psi(a_1)\psi(a_2))$ . It is easily checked that

$$m(a_1, m(a_2, a_3)) = \gamma(\psi(a_1)\psi(a_2)\psi(a_3)) = m(m(a_1, a_2), a_3),$$

so that  $m$  is an associative bilinear map on  $\mathcal{A}$  and defines a new product on  $\mathcal{A}$ . Moreover, because the product on  $\mathcal{B}$  is completely contractive this new product on  $\mathcal{A}$  is completely contractive and the map  $\psi : (\mathcal{A}, m) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  is a completely isometric algebra isomorphism.

Thus, since  $\mathcal{B}$  is an algebra of operators, we see that  $m \in OAP(\mathcal{A})$  and hence by Theorem 2.6 there exists a unique  $z \in QM(\mathcal{A})$  such that  $m(a_1, a_2) = a_1 z a_2$ . Hence,  $\psi(a_1 z a_2) = \psi(m(a_1, a_2)) = \psi(a_1)\psi(a_2)$  and (1) follows.

Applying (1) to  $\gamma$  yields  $w \in QM(\mathcal{B})$  such that

$$\gamma(\psi(a_1)w\psi(a_2)) = \gamma(\psi(a_1))\gamma(\psi(a_2)) = a_1 a_2.$$

Thus,  $\psi(a_1)w\psi(a_2) = \psi(a_1 a_2)$  and so (2) follows.

To see (3), note that  $\pi_l(a_1)\pi_l(a_2) = \psi(a_1)w\psi(a_2)w = \psi(a_1 a_2)w = \pi_l(a_1 a_2)$  with a similar calculation for  $\pi_r$ . Since  $\pi_l(a)b = \psi(a)w\psi(\gamma(b)) = \psi(a\gamma(b)) \in \mathcal{B}$  for every  $b \in \mathcal{B}$ , we see that  $\pi_l(a) \in M_l(\mathcal{B})$  for every  $a \in \mathcal{A}$ , with a similar calculation for  $\pi_r$ .

Now let  $\{e_\alpha\}$  be a contractive, approximate right identity for  $\mathcal{A}$ . We then have that  $\|\psi(a)\| = \lim \|\psi(ae_\alpha)\| = \lim \|\psi(a)w\psi(e_\alpha)\| = \lim \|\pi_l(a)\psi(e_\alpha)\| \leq \|\pi_l(a)\|$ . Thus,  $\pi_l$  is an isometry. The proof that  $\pi_l$  is a complete isometry and the case for  $\pi_r$  are similar.

Finally, if  $\mathcal{A}$  has a right identity  $e$ , then  $\psi(a) = \psi(ae) = \psi(a)w\psi(e)$ . This shows that  $bw\psi(e) = b$  for every  $b \in \mathcal{B}$  and hence  $w\psi(e)$  is a right identity for  $M_r(\mathcal{B})$ . By [7] Corollary 1.3, we have that  $w\psi(e)$  is the identity of  $I_{22}(\mathcal{B})$ . Since  $\|w\| \leq 1$  and  $\|\psi(e)\| \leq 1$ , we have that  $\psi(e) = w^*$  and (5) follows.  $\square$

**Remark 3.2.** (1) When  $\mathcal{B}$  has a contractive right identity, then one may identify  $\mathcal{B} \subseteq M_l(\mathcal{B})$ , but it is not clear if the image of  $\pi_l$  maps onto this copy of  $\mathcal{B}$ . However, in this case it is clear how to define a homomorphism into  $\mathcal{B}$ . Let  $\psi(a_0) = e_{\mathcal{B}}$  and define  $\rho : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  by setting  $\rho(a) = e_{\mathcal{B}}w\psi(a) = \psi(a_0 a)$ . Letting the product in  $\mathcal{B}$  be denoted by  $\odot$  to avoid confusion, we have that  $b_1 \odot b_2 = b_1 e_{\mathcal{B}}^* b_2$ , where the latter product is taken in  $I(S_{\mathcal{B}})$ . Since  $e_{\mathcal{B}}^* e_{\mathcal{B}} = 1_{22}$ , by Proposition 2.10, we have that  $\rho(a_1) \odot \rho(a_2) = e_{\mathcal{B}}w\psi(a_1)e_{\mathcal{B}}^* e_{\mathcal{B}}w\psi(a_2) = e_{\mathcal{B}}w\psi(a_1 a_2) = \rho(a_1 a_2)$ , and so  $\rho$  is a homomorphism. Note that  $\rho$  is onto  $\mathcal{B}$  if and only if  $a_0 \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}$ .

(2) If one considers  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B} = C_2 \subseteq M_2$  and lets  $\psi$  be the identity map, then we are in the situation of the last remark. Thus,  $\pi_l$  is a complete isometry, but since  $M_r(C_2) = \mathbb{C}$ , we have that  $\pi_r$  is not a complete isometry. In fact, it is the compression to the  $(1, 1)$ -entry.

4. FURTHER RESULTS ON  $QMB(X)$ 

In [2] and [4] various characterizations are given of the linear maps of an operator space  $X$  into itself that are given as left multiplication by an element from the left multiplier algebra of  $X$ ,  $M_l(X)$ . In this section we present characterizations of the bilinear maps of an operator space into itself that are in  $QMB(X)$ . Among the results that we obtain is a characterization of when a linear map from  $X$  into  $M_l(X)$  is given as right multiplication by a quasimultiplier. We also identify a subspace of  $QM(X)$ , related to ternary structures on  $X$ , that we denote by  $TER(X)^*$  for which we have  $\|z\| = \|m_z\|_{qm} = \|m_z\|_{cb}$ .

In [4] it was shown that one could determine whether or not a linear map from  $X$  into  $X$  was given by a contractive left multiplier by determining whether or not an associated linear map was completely contractive. The following is an analogous result for determining when a map is given as multiplication by a quasimultiplier.

Recall that given any operator space  $X$ ,  $R_2(X)$  denotes the operator subspace of  $M_2(X)$  consisting of  $1 \times 2$  matrices.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $X$  be an operator space and let  $\gamma : X \rightarrow I_{11}(X)$  be a linear map. There exists  $y \in I(X)^*$  with  $\|y\| \leq 1$  such that  $\gamma(x) = xy$  for every  $x \in X$  if and only if the map  $\beta : R_2(X) \rightarrow I(S_X)$  defined by  $\beta((x_1, x_2)) := \begin{pmatrix} \gamma(x_1) & x_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  is completely contractive.*

*Proof.* Note that if such an element  $y$  exists, then  $\beta$  is given, at least formally, as right multiplication by the matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} y & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{22} \end{pmatrix}$  and since this matrix has norm 1,  $\beta$  should be a complete contraction. To complete this argument, we create a  $C^*$ -algebra where these products occur.

To this end consider the following  $C^*$ -algebra,

$$\mathcal{B} := \begin{pmatrix} I_{11}(X) & I(X) & I(X) \\ I(X)^* & I_{22}(X) & I_{22}(X) \\ I(X)^* & I_{22}(X) & I_{22}(X) \end{pmatrix},$$

where the products are all induced from the products in  $I(S_X)$ . Identifying

$R_2(X)$  with the subspace  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & X & X \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$ , we see that  $\beta$  is given as right

multiplication in the  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}$  by the matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ y & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{22} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ .

For the converse, we must assume that  $\beta$  is a complete contraction and produce the element  $y$ . To this end we create a second  $C^*$ -algebra,  $\mathcal{C}$  and an operator system  $\mathcal{S}$ .

Let

$$\mathcal{C} := \begin{pmatrix} I_{11}(X) & I_{11}(X) & I(X) \\ I_{11}(X) & I_{11}(X) & I(X) \\ I(X)^* & I(X)^* & I_{22}(X) \end{pmatrix},$$

where the products are all induced from the products in  $I(S_X)$  and let

$$\mathcal{S} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{C}1_{11} & X & X \\ X^* & \mathbb{C}1_{22} & 0 \\ X^* & 0 & \mathbb{C}1_{22} \end{pmatrix} \subseteq \mathcal{B}.$$

We define  $\Phi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$  by

$$\Phi \left( \begin{pmatrix} \lambda 1_{11} & x_1 & x_2 \\ x_3^* & \mu 1_{22} & 0 \\ x_4^* & 0 & \nu 1_{22} \end{pmatrix} \right) := \begin{pmatrix} \lambda 1_{11} & \gamma(x_1) & x_2 \\ \gamma(x_3)^* & \mu 1_{11} & 0 \\ x_4^* & 0 & \nu 1_{22} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since  $\beta$  is completely contractive,  $\Phi$  is completely positive and since  $\mathcal{C}$  is clearly an injective  $C^*$ -algebra, we may extend  $\Phi$  to a completely positive map on all of  $\mathcal{B}$ , which we still denote by  $\Phi$ . Because  $\Phi$  fixes the diagonal, it will be a bimodule map over the diagonal. Also note that the compression of  $\mathcal{S}$  to the span of the first and third entries is a copy of  $S_X$  and that  $\Phi$  fixes this operator system.

By the rigidity properties of the injective envelope, we see that necessarily

$$\Phi \left( \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & b \\ 0 & \mu 1_{22} & 0 \\ c^* & 0 & d \end{pmatrix} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & b \\ 0 & \mu 1_{11} & 0 \\ c^* & 0 & d \end{pmatrix},$$

for every  $a \in I_{11}(X), b, c \in I(X), d \in I_{22}(X)$  and  $\mu \in \mathbb{C}$ .

These matrices that are fixed by  $\Phi$  form a common  $C^*$ -subalgebra of  $\mathcal{B}$  and  $\mathcal{C}$  and hence  $\Phi$  will necessarily be a bimodule map over this  $C^*$ -subalgebra.

Thus, we will have for any  $x \in X$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \gamma(x) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} &= \Phi \left( \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \Phi \left( \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & x \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{22} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & x \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \Phi \left( \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1_{22} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & x \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & y & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $y$  is the image of  $1_{22}$  under the restriction of  $\Phi$  to the subspaces corresponding to the (3,2)-entries.

Equating entries of the matrices occurring in the first and last expressions, we see that  $\gamma(x) = xy$ , and the proof is complete.  $\square$

We state the corresponding result for maps into the right multiplier algebra without proof.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $X$  be an operator space and let  $\psi : X \rightarrow I_{22}(X)$  be a linear map. There exists  $y \in I(X)^*$  such that  $\psi(x) = yx$  for every  $x \in X$  if*

and only if the map  $\alpha : C_2(X) \rightarrow I(S_X)$  defined by  $\alpha\left(\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix}\right) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1 \\ 0 & \psi(x_2) \end{pmatrix}$  is completely contractive.

The above theorem yields a method for determining whether or not a bilinear map  $m : X \times X \rightarrow X$  is a contractive quasimultiplier, i.e., whether or not  $m \in OAP(X)$ .

**Corollary 4.3.** *Let  $X$  be an operator space and let  $m : X \times X \rightarrow X$  be a bilinear map. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $m \in OAP(X)$ ;
- (2) there exists a linear map  $\gamma : X \rightarrow M_l(X)$  such that  $m(x, y) = \gamma(x)y$  and the map  $\beta : R_2(X) \rightarrow I(S_X)$  defined by  $\beta((x_1, x_2)) = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma(x_1) & x_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  is completely contractive;
- (3) there exists a linear map  $\psi : X \rightarrow M_r(X)$  such that  $m(x_1, x_2) = x_1\psi(x_2)$  and the map  $\alpha : C_2(X) \rightarrow I(S_X)$  defined by  $\alpha\left(\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1 \\ 0 & \psi(x_2) \end{pmatrix}$  is completely contractive.

Recall that by the results of [4] (see also [18]) to determine whether or not  $x \rightarrow m(x_1, x)$  is a contractive left multiplier it is necessary and sufficient that the map  $\tau_{x_1} : C_2(X) \rightarrow C_2(X)$  defined by  $\tau_{x_1}\left(\begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix}\right) := \begin{pmatrix} m(x_1, x_2) \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix}$  be a complete contraction. There is a similar result involving  $R_2(X)$  for determining when a map is a contractive right multiplier.

Thus, by combining Corollary 4.3 with the characterizations of multipliers, one obtains a **bootstrap method** for determining whether or not a bilinear map  $m : X \times X \rightarrow X$  is a contractive quasimultiplier, i.e., whether or not  $m \in OAP(X)$ .

**Remark 4.4.** *Since we have obtained necessary and sufficient conditions for a bilinear map to be in  $OAP(X)$ , we have in some sense given a full generalization of the Blecher-Ruan-Sinclair characterization of unital operator algebras [8] to arbitrary operator algebras. However, to prove the original BRS theorem by applying Corollary 4.3, one still needs to use the theory of multipliers and the proof that one obtains in this fashion is not really different from the proof given in [18].*

*In the thesis of the first author [17], a new direct characterization of the bilinear maps in  $OAP(X)$  is given that is independent of the theory of multipliers and is sufficiently simple that the BRS theorem can be deduced directly from this characterization.*

The space  $QMB(X)$  currently is endowed with two generally different norms,  $\|\cdot\|_{cb}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{qm}$ . The first norm comes from its natural inclusion into the space of completely bounded bilinear maps from  $X$  into  $X$  and

the second from its identification with the space  $QM(X)$ . The next results allow us to prove that for a subspace of  $QM(X)$ , that is related to ternary structures on  $X$ , these two norms are the same.

**Theorem 4.5.** *Let  $X$  be an operator space and let  $Y = \begin{pmatrix} X \\ M_r(X) \end{pmatrix}$  where we give  $Y$  the operator space structure that comes from its identification as a subspace of  $I(S_X)$ . Then  $I(S_Y)$  can be identified with the injective  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B} := \begin{pmatrix} I_{11}(X) & I(X) & I(X) \\ I(X)^* & I_{22}(X) & I_{22}(X) \\ I(X)^* & I_{22}(X) & I_{22}(X) \end{pmatrix}$  in such a way that  $I_{11}(Y) = I(S_X)$ ,  $I(Y) = \begin{pmatrix} I(X) \\ I_{22}(X) \end{pmatrix}$  and  $I_{22}(Y) = I_{22}(X)$ .*

*Proof.* We identify  $S_Y = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{C} & Y \\ Y^* & \mathbb{C} \end{pmatrix}$  with an operator system in  $\mathcal{B}$  via the map that sends  $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha & y_1 \\ y_2^* & \beta \end{pmatrix}$  where  $y_i = \begin{pmatrix} x_i \\ t_i \end{pmatrix}$  to  $\begin{pmatrix} \alpha 1_{11} & 0 & x_1 \\ 0 & \alpha 1_{22} & t_1 \\ x_2^* & t_2^* & \beta 1_{22} \end{pmatrix}$ . The proof of the theorem will be complete if we can show that any completely positive map  $\Phi : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  that is the identity on  $S_Y$  must be the identity on  $\mathcal{B}$ .

To this end let  $\gamma : I(S_X) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$  be defined by  $\gamma\left(\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}\right) := \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & b \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ c & 0 & d \end{pmatrix}$

and let  $\delta : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow I(S_X)$  be defined by  $\delta((a_{i,j})) := \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{13} \\ a_{31} & a_{33} \end{pmatrix}$ . Since  $\delta \circ \Phi \circ \gamma$  is the identity on  $S_X$  by rigidity it must be the identity on  $I(S_X)$ .

To simplify notation, we define elements of  $\mathcal{B}$  by  $E_{11} := \begin{pmatrix} 1_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ ,  $E_{23} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1_{22} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  and give similar definitions to  $E_{22}, E_{32}, E_{33}$ . Note that because  $I(X)$  need not contain an identity we do not attempt to define  $E_{12}, E_{13}, E_{21}$  and  $E_{31}$ .

We first prove that  $\Phi$  fixes the five ‘‘matrix units’’ defined above. Note that since  $\Phi$  fixes  $S_Y$  we already have that  $\Phi(E_{11} + E_{22}) = E_{11} + E_{22}$ ,  $\Phi(E_{33}) = E_{33}$  and  $\Phi(E_{23}) = E_{23}$ .

Since  $\delta \circ \Phi \circ \gamma\left(\begin{pmatrix} 1_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) = \begin{pmatrix} 1_{11} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ , it follows that  $\Phi(E_{11}) =: P = (P_{ij})$  with  $P_{11} = 1_{11}$ . Since  $\Phi$  is contractive and positive, it follows that  $P_{ij} = 0$  when  $(i, j)$  is  $(1, 2)$ ,  $(1, 3)$ ,  $(2, 1)$ , or  $(3, 1)$  and that  $P_{33} \geq 0$ . But since  $\Phi(E_{33}) = E_{33}$  and  $\|\Phi(E_{11} + E_{33})\| \leq 1$ , we have that  $P_{33} = 0$ . Now the positivity of  $P$  implies that  $P_{23} = P_{32} = 0$ .

Since  $E_{23}^* E_{23} = E_{33} = \Phi(E_{23}^* E_{23})$  and  $\Phi(E_{23}) = E_{23}$ , we have that  $E_{23}$  is in the right multiplicative domain of  $\Phi$ , that is  $\Phi(BE_{23}) = \Phi(B)E_{23}, \forall B \in$

$\mathcal{B}$ . If we let  $\Phi(E_{22}) =: Q = (Q_{ij})$ , then  $E_{23} = \Phi(E_{22}E_{23}) = QE_{23}$  and it follows that  $Q_{22} = 1_{22}$ . But since  $\Phi(E_{11} + E_{22}) = E_{11} + E_{22}$ , it follows that  $P_{22} = 0$  and  $Q = E_{22}$ .

Thus, we have shown that these five matrix units are fixed by  $\Phi$  as was claimed. Since the span of these matrix units are a  $C^*$ -subalgebra of  $\mathcal{B}$ , we have that  $\Phi$  must be a bimodule map over this  $C^*$ -subalgebra.

Since this subalgebra contains the diagonal matrices we see that there exist maps  $\phi_{ij}$  such that  $\Phi((B_{ij})) = (\phi_{ij}(B_{ij}))$ . To prove that  $\Phi$  is the identity map, it will be enough to show that each  $\phi_{ij}$  is the identity map on its respective domain.

Using the fact that  $\delta \circ \Phi \circ \gamma$  is the identity on  $I(S_X)$  yields that  $\phi_{11}$  is the identity map on  $I_{11}(X)$  and similarly  $\phi_{13}, \phi_{31}$  and  $\phi_{33}$  are the identities on their respective domains.

To see that  $\phi_{12}$  is the identity on its domain, note that for any  $u \in I(X)$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & u & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) &= \Phi\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & u \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} E_{32}\right) = \Phi\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & u \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right) E_{32} = \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & u \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} E_{32} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that what was used in this argument was the bimodularity property of the matrix units and the fact that certain maps were the identity maps. A similar argument shows that  $\phi_{21}, \phi_{23}$  and  $\phi_{32}$  are all the identity maps on their respective domains. Finally, that  $\phi_{22}$  is the identity follows from the rigidity of the upper left corner  $I(S_X)$  of  $\mathcal{B}$ . This completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

Given any operator space  $X$  the sets  $M_l(X) \cap M_l(X)^*$  and  $M_r(X) \cap M_r(X)^*$  are  $C^*$ -subalgebras of  $I_{11}(Y)$  and  $I_{22}(X)$ , respectively. In [7] these sets were denoted  $IM_l^*(X)$  and  $IM_r^*(X)$ , respectively. They were shown to be equal to the sets  $\mathcal{A}_l(X)$  and  $\mathcal{A}_r(X)$  of adjointable left and right multipliers, respectively, introduced in [2]. We shall use the latter notation for these sets.

**Definition 4.6.** *Given an operator space  $X$ , we set  $TER(X) := X \cap QM(X)^*$  and we call this the **ternary subspace of  $X$** .*

Note that in the multiplication inherited from  $I(S_X)$  we have that  $TER(X) \cdot TER(X)^* \cdot TER(X) \subseteq TER(X)$ . The following results give further properties of this subspace.

**Corollary 4.7.** *Let  $X$  be an operator space, let  $Y := \begin{pmatrix} X \\ M_r(X) \end{pmatrix}$  where we give  $Y$  the operator space structure that comes from its identification as a*

subspace of  $I(S_X)$  and let  $I(S_Y)$  be identified with the  $C^*$ -algebra  $\mathcal{B}$  as above. Then  $M_l(Y) = \begin{pmatrix} M_l(X) & X \\ QM(X) & M_r(X) \end{pmatrix}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_l(Y) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{A}_l(X) & TER(X) \\ TER(X)^* & \mathcal{A}_r(X) \end{pmatrix}$ .

*Proof.* One simply checks that  $M_l(X)$  is exactly the matrix in  $I_{11}(Y) = I(S_X)$  that leaves  $Y$  invariant under left multiplication.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.8.** *Let  $X$  be an operator space, let  $x \in TER(X)$ , set  $z = x^* \in QM(X)$  and let  $m_z : X \times X \rightarrow X$  be the associated bilinear map, then  $\|z\| = \|m_z\|_{qm} = \|m_z\|_{cb}$ .*

*Proof.* We have that  $\|z\| = \|m_z\|_{qm}$  by definition and clearly,  $\|m_z\|_{cb} \leq \|z\|$ . Clearly,  $\|z\| = \left\| \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ z & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right\|$  and this latter matrix is in  $\mathcal{A}_l(Y)$ . By Theorem 1.9 (i) of [7] the norm of this latter matrix is equal to the norm of the map it induces acting by left multiplication on  $Y$ , regarded as an element of  $CB_l(Y)$ .

Hence given any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a matrix over  $X$ ,  $\|(x_{ij})\| \leq 1$  such that  $\|(zx_{ij})\| \geq \|z\| - \epsilon$ . The matrix  $(zx_{ij})$  is a matrix of right multipliers, and so applying [7] again, we can find another matrix over  $X$ ,  $\|(y_{ij})\| \leq 1$  such that

$$\left\| \left( \sum_k m_z(y_{ik}, x_{kj}) \right) \right\| = \left\| \left( \sum_k y_{ik} z x_{kj} \right) \right\| \geq \|(zx_{ij})\| - \epsilon \geq \|z\| - 2\epsilon.$$

Thus, we have that  $\|m_z\|_{cb} \geq \|z\| - 2\epsilon$  and since  $\epsilon$  was arbitrary, the result follows.  $\square$

## 5. QUASICENTRALIZERS AND QUASIHOMOMORPHISMS

We introduce a new family of bilinear maps that we call the *quasicentralizers* of an operator space and a set of maps that we call the *quasihomomorphisms* and explore the relationships between these maps and the space  $QMB(X)$ .

**Definition 5.1.** *Let  $X$  be an operator space and let  $m : X \times X \rightarrow X$  be a bilinear map. We call  $m$  a **quasicentralizer**<sup>1</sup> provided that there exists completely bounded maps,  $\gamma : X \rightarrow M_l(X)$  and  $\psi : X \rightarrow M_r(X)$  such that  $m(x, y) = \gamma(x)y = x\psi(y)$  for every  $x, y \in X$ . We let  $QC(X)$  denote the set of quasicentralizers. We call a linear map  $\gamma : X \rightarrow M_l(X)$  (respectively,  $\psi : X \rightarrow M_r(X)$ ) a **left (right) quasihomomorphism**<sup>2</sup> provided that  $\gamma(x)\gamma(y) = \gamma(\gamma(x)y)$  (respectively,  $\psi(x)\psi(y) = \psi(x\psi(y))$ ) for every  $x, y \in X$ .*

These definitions are motivated by the following observations. If  $m = m_z \in QMB(X)$  for some  $z \in QM(X)$ , then  $m(x, y) = \pi_l(x)y = x\pi_r(y)$

<sup>1</sup>This is a generalization of a *quasi-centralizer* defined for an operator algebra with a two-sided contractive approximate identity in [17] Definition 3.2.1.

<sup>2</sup>This is different from a *quasi-homomorphism* which the first author defined in [17] Definition 3.1.1 (2).

where  $\pi_l(x) = xz$  and  $\pi_r(y) = zy$ . Thus,  $QMB(X) \subseteq QC(X)$ . Moreover, the maps  $\pi_l$  and  $\pi_r$  are left and right quasihomomorphisms, respectively.

Note that  $QC(X)$  is a linear subspace of the space of bilinear maps from  $X$  to  $X$ .

We begin with a few elementary observations about the relationships between these concepts.

**Proposition 5.2.** *Let  $X$  be an operator space. A linear map  $\gamma : X \rightarrow M_l(X)$  (respectively,  $\psi : X \rightarrow M_r(X)$ ) is a left (respectively, right) quasihomomorphism if and only if the bilinear map  $m(x, y) = \gamma(x)y$  (respectively,  $m(x, y) = x\psi(y)$ ) is associative. In this case,  $\gamma$  (respectively,  $\psi$ ) is a homomorphism of the algebra  $(X, m)$  into  $M_l(X)$  (respectively,  $M_r(X)$ ).*

*Proof.* The proof is straightforward.  $\square$

We shall refer to  $m$  as the *product associated with the quasihomomorphism*.

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $X$  be an operator space, let  $\gamma : X \rightarrow M_l(X)$  (respectively,  $\psi : X \rightarrow M_r(X)$ ) be a linear map and let  $m(x, y) := \gamma(x)y$  (respectively,  $m(x, y) := x\psi(y)$ ), then  $\|m\|_{cb} = \|\gamma\|_{cb}$  (respectively,  $\|m\|_{cb} = \|\psi\|_{cb}$ ).*

*Proof.* By [7], we have that the norm of a left (respectively, right) multiplier is given by the cb-norm of its action as a left (respectively, right) multiplication. Thus, given  $\|(x_{ij})\| \leq 1$  and  $\|(y_{ij})\| \leq 1$ , we have that

$$\left\| \left( \sum_k m(x_{ik}, y_{kj}) \right) \right\| = \left\| \left( \sum_k \gamma(x_{ik}) y_{kj} \right) \right\| \leq \|(\gamma(x_{ij}))\| \cdot \|(y_{ij})\| \leq \|\gamma\|_{cb}$$

and it follows that  $\|m\|_{cb} \leq \|\gamma\|_{cb}$ .

The other inequalities follow similarly.  $\square$

By the above results, the product associated with a completely contractive quasihomomorphism is completely contractive, i.e., is in  $CCP(X)$ .

**Example 5.4.** *This is an example of a product associated with a completely contractive quasihomomorphism that is in  $CCP(X)$  but not in  $OAP(X)$ .*

Recall the product  $m_1$  on  $C_2$  of Example 2.8 that is not in  $OAP(C_2)$ . We have that  $M_l(C_2) = M_2$  and that  $\gamma : C_2 \rightarrow M_2$  defined by  $\gamma\left(\begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix}\right) := \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 \\ 0 & b \end{pmatrix}$  is a completely contractive quasihomomorphism with  $m_1$  the associated product. Thus,  $\gamma$  is a completely contractive homomorphism of  $(C_2, m_1)$  into an operator algebra, but since  $m_1$  is not an operator algebra product on  $C_2$ , there can be no completely isometric homomorphism of  $(C_2, m_1)$  into an operator algebra. It is interesting to note that  $m_1$  is also not a quasiceutralizer. In fact, it is not hard to show by a direct calculation that  $QC(C_2) = QMB(C_2)$ .

**Remark 5.5.** *Is every quasiceutralizer, automatically an associative bilinear map? Is every associative quasiceutralizer in  $QMB(X)$ ? We conjecture that the answer is no to both of these questions, but we do not know of an example.*

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. P. Blecher, *A completely bounded characterization of operator algebras*, Mathematische Annalen **303** (1995), 227-239.
- [2] D. P. Blecher, *The Shilov boundary of an operator space and the characterization theorems*, Journal of Functional Analysis **182** (2001), 280-343.
- [3] D. P. Blecher, *One-sided ideals and approximate identities in operator algebras*, Journal of the Australian Mathematical Society, to appear.
- [4] D. P. Blecher, E. G. Effros, and V. Zarikian, *One-sided  $M$ -ideals and multipliers in operator spaces, I*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics **206** (2) (2002), 287-319.
- [5] D. P. Blecher and M. Kaneda, *The ideal envelope of an operator algebra*, Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, to appear.
- [6] D. P. Blecher and V. I. Paulsen, *Tensor products of operator spaces*, Journal of Functional Analysis **99** (1991), 262-292.
- [7] D. P. Blecher and V. I. Paulsen, *Multipliers of operator spaces, and the injective envelope*, Pacific Journal of Mathematics **200** (1) (2001), 1-17.
- [8] D. P. Blecher, Z.-J. Ruan and A. M. Sinclair, *A characterization of operator algebras*, Journal of Functional Analysis **89** (1990), 188-201.
- [9] L. G. Brown, *Close hereditary  $C^*$ -subalgebras and the structure of quasi-multipliers*, MSRI preprint, August 1985.
- [10] L. G. Brown, J. Mingo and N.-T. Shen, *Quasi-multipliers and embeddings of Hilbert  $C^*$ -bimodules*, Canadian Journal of Mathematics **46** (6) (1994), 1150-1174.
- [11] E. Christensen, E. G. Effros and A. M. Sinclair, *Completely bounded multilinear maps and  $C^*$ -algebraic cohomology*, Inventiones Mathematicae **90** (1987), 279-296.
- [12] M. Frank and V. I. Paulsen, *Injective envelopes of  $C^*$ -algebras as operator modules*, preprint, April 1999, Pacific Journal of Mathematics, to appear.
- [13] M. Hamana, *Injective envelopes of Banach modules*, Tôhoku Mathematical Journal (2) **30** (1978), 439-453.
- [14] M. Hamana, *Injective envelopes of  $C^*$ -algebras*, Journal of Mathematical Society of Japan **31** (1), (1979), 181-197.
- [15] M. Hamana, *Injective envelopes of operator systems*, Publications of the Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Kyoto University **15** (1979), 773-785.
- [16] M. Hamana, *Injective envelopes of dynamical systems*, preprint, April 1991.
- [17] M. Kaneda, *Multipliers and Algebrizations of Operator Spaces*, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Houston, August 2003.
- [18] V. I. Paulsen, *Completely Bounded Maps and Operator Algebras*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, Vol. 78, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [19] G. K. Pedersen,  *$C^*$ -algebras and Their Automorphism Groups*, L.M.S. Monographs, Academic Press, 1979.

MASAYOSHI KANEDA: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, 103 MULTIPURPOSE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY BUILDING, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, IRVINE, IRVINE, CA 92697-3875 U.S.A.

*E-mail address:* mkaneda@math.uci.edu, URL: <http://www.math.uci.edu/~mkaneda/>

VERN I. PAULSEN: DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON, 4800 CALHOUN ROAD, HOUSTON, TX 77204-3008 U.S.A.

*E-mail address:* vern@math.uh.edu, URL: <http://www.math.uh.edu/~vern/>